

Page 6, line 1: delete "The video camera 6 has on its bottom surface formed" and  
insert - Formed on the bottom surface of the video camera 6 is ~~therefor~~.

Page 6, line 3: delete "with".

Page 7, line 19: delete "on side" and insert -- on a side -- therefor.

Page 7, line 20: delete "portion 20" and insert -- portion 2 -- therefor.

Page 7, line 23: delete "so far".

Page 8, line 3: delete "printer 1" and insert -- camera 6 -- therefor.

Page 8, line 12: insert -- be -- after "can".

Page 9: delete lines 24-27.

Page 10: delete line 1.

**In the abstract of the disclosure:**

Line 1: delete "comprising" and insert -- comprises -- therefor.

**In the claims:**

claim 2, line 2: delete "of"; line 3: delete "and"; line 4: delete ", a video picture"  
and insert -- is -- therefor; line 4: delete "or" and insert -- , and -- therefor.

**REMARKS**

**I. Introduction**

Applicants thank Examiner Greening for thorough examination of the application,  
as detailed in the Office action of 07 October 1997 (paper 3).

Applicants have corrected the drawings, specification, abstract of the disclosure,  
and claim 2. No new matter has been entered. Accordingly, claims 1-6 remain under  
prosecution in this application. In view of the arguments to follow, applicants  
respectfully request reconsideration of the Office action.

A

## **II. Drawings**

The drawings have been objected to because Figure 1 lacks the label "Prior Art". The label has been added, and Figure 1 carrying the correction is attached to the present response. Contemporaneously, a letter to the Draftsman is being sent.

The correction being taken into consideration, applicants believe that the objection is thus overcome and respectfully submit that it be withdrawn.

## **III. Claim rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been corrected addressing Examiner's criticism of the claim's language. Thus it is believed that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection is overcome, and applicants respectfully submit that it be withdrawn.

## **IV. Claim rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Finelli et al.

The Examiner asserts that "Finelli shows, in figure 1, a video printer housing (12) to which a video camera (10) can be attached. As shown in figure 3, once the two are attached, they can communicate with each other through an interface (108, 112). Figure 1 shows that both the camera and the printer include an operation system (42 and 64, respectively). As discussed in col. 6 in the last paragraph, these interface can be used interchangeably. That is, the interface system on the printer can be used to control the camera."

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Finelli is concerned about improving a system providing "photographic quality hard copy prints" (Finelli, column 1, line 32) in a handheld electronic imaging camera that can electronically record an image of a scene and thereafter print out a hard copy

A

print of the recorded image on a nonphotosensitive image receiving sheet (Finelli, column 1, lines 16-19). Finelli discloses an electronic imaging camera employing a film cassette with self-developing film units of a type manufactured by Polaroid Corporation (Finelli, column 3, lines 37-40) and a hard copy printer. A close examining of Finelli does not reveal either video printer housing or video camera. It is not surprising since Polaroid Corporation, the assignee of Finelli, is well known to be engaged in photographic rather than in video industry. Reference number 12 in Finelli belongs to the electronic imaging camera that can electronically record an image of a scene (Finelli, column 1, lines 16-17), whereas reference 10 denotes the electronic imaging system comprising electronic imaging camera 12 and hard copy printer 14 (Finelli, column 2, lines 60-63).

On the other hand, the applicants' invention deals with video printer 1 for printing out a video picture (-s) from a footage that has been shot and recorded by a video camera 6. In other words, the system according to the present invention and Finelli's system have differing areas of application and accordingly comprise different components.

With the above in view, it is believed that Finelli, as structurally different from what is claimed in the applicants' invention, does not destroy the novelty of claim 1. It is for that reason that applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Additionally, applicants assert that Finelli does not suggest its modification to replace the imaging camera with a video camera.

For that reason, applicants believe that claim 1 is non-obvious relative to Finelli and is allowable.


Claims 2-6 are believed to be allowable as dependent on the allowable claim 1.

A

### V. Conclusion

With all the above taken into account, it is believed that claims 1-6 are in the condition for allowance, and this favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,




Ronald P. Kananen, Reg. No. 24,104

Dated:

Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street N.W.  
Suite 501  
Washington DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 955-3760  
Facsimile: (202) 955-3751

FIG. 1



PRIOR ART